

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

Please substitute Fig. 1 with the replacement sheet attached hereto.

## Remarks

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

The drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character “102” has been used to designate all SONET ADM Networks in Figure 1. Fig. 1 has been amended accordingly.

The specification was also amended to correct the typographical error on page 8, line 21, specifically replacing the word “signal” with “single”. The applicants thank the Examiner for his observation of the error. The specification was also amended on pages 6 and 7 to reflect the amendments to Fig. 1 and to correct typographical errors on page 7 and 9.

Of previously pending claims 1-39, all claims were rejected. Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 17-19, 23-25, 27, 28, 30, 33-35, 38, and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over European Patent Appln. No. EP 0902590, published March 17, 1999 with B. Shai *et al.*, inventors (Shai), in view of a paper by O. Verscheure *et al.*, “Joint Impact of MPEG-2 Encoding Rate and ATM Cell Losses on Video Quality,” printed in USA 1998 (Verscheure), and in further view of a white paper entitled, “Generic Framing Procedure ITU-TG.7041” by H. Qureshi *et al.*, printed in USA July 23, 2002 (Qureshi). Claims 4, 13, 20, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Shai in view of Verscheure in further view of Qureshi in even further view of an application note entitled, “An Overview of ITU-T G.709”, Agilent Technologies, printed in USA September 1, 2001 (Agilent). Claims 6, 7, 15, 16, 21, 22, 31, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Shai in view of Verscheure in further view of Qureshi and in even further view of a white paper entitled, “Virtual Concatenations + LCAS,” by F. Olsson *et al.*, publication date unstated (Olsson). Claims 10, 26, 36, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Shai in view of Verscheure in further view of Qureshi in even further view of a paper entitled, “Clock Recovery for Circuit Emulation Services over ATM,” by L. Castel-Branco *et al.*, Proceedings of the International IFIP-IEEE Conference on Broad band Communications, 1996 (Castel-Branco).

Accordingly, applicants have amended claims 1, 6-9, 15-17, 21-22, 24-25 and 38-39; canceled claims 2-4, 11-13, 18-20, 27-29 and 33-37; and added claims 40-47.

As amended, independent claims 1, 8, 17, 24, 38 and 39 are not obvious over the cited references. For example, claim 1 now reads:

A method for inserting a serial video data stream into a network transport digital signal formatted in accordance with a hierarchical digital transmission standard, said method comprising:

- segmenting said serial video data stream into a sequence of horizontal scan lines;
- extracting bits from said sequence of horizontal scan lines to form data payloads;
- computing a payload header of N bytes for each data payload, where N is a provisionable value, including a two byte time stamp counter value and an associated two byte CRC value;
- forming GFP-T frames with said data payloads and corresponding payload headers; and
- mapping said GFP-T frames into said network transport digital signal in accordance with said hierarchical digital transmission standard.

And claim 8 reads:

A method for extracting a serial video data stream from a network transport digital signal formatted in accordance with a hierarchical digital transmission standard, said method comprising:

- demapping GFP-T frames from a signal formatted in accordance with said hierarchical digital transmission standard;
- deencapsulating said GFP-T frames to obtain payload headers and data payloads therein;
- differentiating said data payloads from said payload headers; and
- forming horizontal scan lines of said serial video data stream from said data payloads.

The applicants do not find the limitations of these claims in the cited references.

Independent claims 17, 24, 38 and 39 have similar language. All the independent claims should be considered allowable.

Added claims 40-47 depend in pairs upon independent claims 1, 8, 17 and 24. The applicants believe that the claims have further limitations not found in the cited references and should be allowable in their own right. With respect to all of the pending dependent claims, they should be considered allowable for at least being dependent upon allowable base claims.

Therefore, in view of amendments above and the remarks directed thereto, the applicants request that all rejections be removed, that claims 1, 5-10, 14-17, 21-26, 30-32, and 38-47 be allowed and the case be passed to issue. If a telephone conference would in any way expedite

the prosecution of the application, the Examiner is asked to call the undersigned at (408) 868-4088.

Respectfully submitted,

Aka Chan LLP

/Gary T. Aka/

Gary T. Aka  
Reg. No. 29,038

Aka Chan LLP  
900 Lafayette Street, Suite 710  
Santa Clara, CA 95050  
Tel: (408) 868-4088  
Fax: (408) 608-1599  
E-mail: [gary@akachanlaw.com](mailto:gary@akachanlaw.com)